Exhibit A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

IN RE GOOGLE DIGITAL ADVERTISING ANTITRUST LITIGATION

No. 21-md-3010 (PKC)

This Stipulation Relates To:

THE STATE OF TEXAS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

- against -

GOOGLE LLC,

No. 21-CV-6841 (PKC)

Defendant.

SECOND STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING STATE PLAINTIFFS' STATE LAW CLAIMS

Defendant Google LLC ("Google") and Plaintiffs State of Texas, State of Alaska, State of Arkansas, State of Florida, State of Idaho, State of Indiana, Commonwealth of Kentucky, State of Louisiana, State of Mississippi, State of Missouri, State of Montana, State of Nevada, State of North Dakota, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, State of South Carolina, State of South Dakota, and State of Utah (collectively "State Plaintiffs"; the State Plaintiffs and Google combined are the "Parties") stipulate as follows:

WHEREAS, paragraphs 546 through 602 (Count V) of State Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 195) ("TAC") describe State Plaintiffs' state antitrust claims;

WHEREAS, on September 13, 2022, the Court issued its Opinion and Order on Google's Motion to Dismiss Counts I Through IV of the States' Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 308, the "Opinion and Order");

WHEREAS, on November 18, 2022, the Court issued Pre-Trial Order No. 4, ordering State Plaintiffs and Google to meet and confer on a stipulation as to the effect of the Opinion and Order on any of the State Plaintiffs' state law claims and to report to the Court within 21 days (*see* ECF No. 392, ¶ 4);

WHEREAS, on December 9, 2022, pursuant to Pre-Trial Order No. 4, the Parties submitted a stipulation (the "First Stipulation") to the Court regarding the effect of the Opinion and Order on any of the State Plaintiffs' state law claims (*see* ECF No. 415);

WHEREAS, paragraph 2 of the First Stipulation stated that, "[a]ny state law antitrust claim is deemed dismissed to the extent that it is based on conduct alleged to serve as a basis for a federal antitrust claim that the Opinion and Order dismissed";

WHEREAS, on December 14, 2022, the Court so ordered the Parties' First Stipulation, and in so doing, added the following proviso: "[b]y February 24, 2023, the parties shall submit a stipulation describing with particularity, the claims or portions of claims governed by paragraph 2 [of the First Stipulation]," (ECF No. 417, at 3); and

NOW THEREFORE, the Parties, through their respective counsel, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that the Network Bidding Agreement between Google and Meta Platforms, Inc. (f/k/a as Facebook) (the "NBA") constitutes an illegal contract, combination or conspiracy, such claim is hereby deemed dismissed.

- 2. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Encrypted User IDs constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for ad exchanges, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.
- 3. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Dynamic Allocation ("DA") constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for publisher ad servers, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.
- 4. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Enhanced Dynamic Allocation ("EDA") constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for publisher ad servers, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.
- 5. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Dynamic Revenue Share ("DRS") constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for publisher ad servers, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.
- 6. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Reserve Price Optimization ("RPO") constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of the market for ad exchanges, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.

3

- 7. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Exchange Bidding constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for ad exchanges, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.
- 8. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Accelerated Mobile Pages ("AMP") constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for ad exchanges, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.
- 9. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the TAC based on Google's use of Privacy Sandbox, such claim is deemed to be unripe for determination.
- 10. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges in the TAC a state antitrust claim based on Google's use of DA, Google's use of DRS, or Google's combined use of DA and DRS, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct has continuing adverse effects.
 - 11. [omitted]
- 12. State Plaintiffs have not alleged in the TAC that (a) Google's use of Encrypted User IDs constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of the market for publisher ad servers; (b) Google's use of RPO constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of markets for publisher ad servers, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools; (c) Google's use of Exchange Bidding constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of the market for publisher ad servers; or (d) Google's use of AMP constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization of the market for publisher ad servers.
 - 13. [omitted]
 - 14. [omitted]

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: February 24, 2023

For Plaintiff States of Texas, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana (The Lanier Law Firm only), Mississippi, North Dakota, South Carolina, and South Dakota:

s/ Ashley Keller

Ashley Keller

Admitted Pro Hac Vice ack@kellerpostman.com

Jason A. Zweig

jaz@kellerpostman.com

Brooke Clason Smith

brooke.smith@kellerpostman.com

150 N. Riverside Plaza, Suite 4100

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 741-5220

Zina Bash

zina.bash@kellerpostman.com

111 Congress Avenue, Suite 500

Austin, TX 78701 (501) 690-0990

KELLER POSTMAN LLC

/s/ Mark Lanier

W. Mark Lanier (lead counsel)

Texas Bar No. 11934600

Mark.Lanier@LanierLawFirm.com

Alex J. Brown

Alex.Brown@LanierLawFirm.com

Zeke DeRose III

Zeke.DeRose@LanierLawFirm.com

10940 W. Sam Houston Parkway N. Suite 100

Houston, Texas 77064 Telephone: (713) 659-5200

Facsimile: (713) 659-2204 THE LANIER LAW FIRM, P.C.

Attorneys for Plaintiff States of Texas, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana (The Lanier Law Firm only), Mississippi, North Dakota, South Carolina, and South Dakota

/s/ <mark>DRAFT</mark>

Eric Mahr

FRESHFIELDS BRUCKHAUS DERINGER US LLP

700 13th Street, NW

10th Floor

Washington, DC 20005 Telephone: (202) 777-4545

Email: eric.mahr@freshfields.com

Justina K. Sessions

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI

Professional Corporation

One Market Plaza

Spear Tower, Suite 3300

San Francisco, California 94105

Telephone: (415) 947-2197 Email: jsessions@wsgr.com

Counsel for Defendant Google LLC

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF TEXAS:

KEN PAXTON Attorney General

/s/ Shawn E. Cowles

Brent Webster, First Assistant Attorney
General of Texas
Brent.Webster@oag.texas.gov
Grant Dorfman, Deputy First Assistant
Attorney General
Grant.Dorfman@oag.texas.gov
Aaron Reitz, Deputy Attorney General for
Legal Strategy Aaron.Reitz@oag.texas.gov
Shawn E. Cowles, Deputy Attorney
General for Civil Litigation
Shawn.Cowles@oag.texas.gov Nanette
DiNunzio, Associate Deputy Attorney
General for Civil Litigation

James R. Lloyd, Chief, Antitrust Division James.Lloyd@oag.texas.gov Trevor Young, Deputy Chief, Antitrust Division Trevor.Young@oag.texas.gov

Ralph Molina, Assistant Attorney General, General Litigation Division Ralph.Molina@oag.texas.gov

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

P.O. Box 12548 Austin, TX 78711-2548 (512) 936-1674

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Texas

Nanette.Dinunzio@oag.texas.gov

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF ALASKA:

TREG R. TAYLOR Attorney General

By: <u>/s/Jeff Pickett</u>
Jeff Pickett
Senior Assistant Attorney General, Special Litigation Section jeff.pickett@alaska.gov

Attorney for Plaintiff State of Alaska

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF ARKANSAS:

TIM GRIFFIN ATTORNEY GENERAL

AMANDA J. WENTZ
Ark. Bar No. 2021066
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Arkansas Attorney General
323 Center Street, Suite 200

Little Rock, AR 72201

(501) 682-1178

Amanda.Wentz@ArkansasAG.gov

Attorney for Plaintiff State of Arkansas

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF FLORIDA:

ASHLEY MOODY, Attorney General

/s/ R. Scott Palmer

R. SCOTT PALMER, Special Counsel, Complex Enforcement Chief, FL Bar No. 220353 JOHN GUARD, Chief Deputy Attorney General LEE ISTRAIL, Assistant Attorney General CHRISTOPHER KNIGHT, Assistant Attorney General ANDREW BUTLER, Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General, State of Florida PL-01 The Capitol Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Phone: 850-414-3300

Email: scott.palmer@myfloridalegal.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Florida

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF IDAHO:

RAÚL R. LABRADOR Attorney General

/s/ John K. Olson

John K. Olson, Acting Division Chief, Consumer Protection Division

Consumer Protection Division
Office of the Attorney General 954
W. Jefferson Street, 2nd Floor
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, Idaho 83720-0010
Telephone: (208) 334-2424
john.olson@ag.idaho.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Idaho

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF INDIANA:

THEODORE E. ROKITA Attorney General

The Office of the Indiana Attorney General

By:

Scott Barnhart

Chief Counsel and Director of Consumer Protection

Indiana Atty. No. 25474-82

Indiana Government Center South – 5th Fl. 302

W. Washington Street

Indianapolis, IN 46204-2770

Phone: (317) 232-6309 Fax: (317) 232-7979

Email: scott.barnhart@atg.in.gov

Matthew Michaloski

Deputy Attorney General

Indiana Atty. No. 35313-49

Indiana Government Center South – 5th Fl. 302

W. Washington Street

Indianapolis, IN 46204-2770

Phone: (317) 234-1479 Fax: (317) 232-7979

Email: matthew.michaloski@atg.in.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Indiana

FOR PLAINTIFF COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY:

DANIEL CAMERON Attorney General

J. Christian Lewis

Commissioner of the Office of Consumer Protection

Christian.Lewis@ky.gov

Philip R. Heleringer, Executive Director of the Office of Consumer Protection Philip.Heleringer@ky.gov

Jonathan E. Farmer, Deputy Executive Director of the Office of Consumer Protection Jonathan.Farmer@ky.gov

Office of the Attorney General Commonwealth of Kentucky 1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200 Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Tel: 502-696-5300

Attorneys for Commonwealth of Kentucky

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF LOUISIANA:

HON. JEFF LANDRY ATTORNEY GENERAL, STATE OF LOUISIANA Michael Dupree Christopher J. Alderman 1885 N. 3rd Street Baton Rouge, LA 70802

s/James R. Dugan, II

James R. Dugan, II (pro hac vice)
TerriAnne Benedetto (pro hac vice)
The Dugan Law Firm
365 Canal Street
One Canal Place, Suite 1000
New Orleans, LA 70130 PH:
(504) 648-0180

FX: (504) 649-0181

EM: jdugan@dugan-lawfirm.com tbenedetto@dugan-lawfirm.com

James Williams CHEHARDY SHERMAN WILLIAM, LLP Galleria Boulevard, Suite 1100 Metairie, LA 70001

PH: (504) 833-5600 FX: (504) 833-8080 EM: jmw@chehardy.com

Attorneys for the State of Louisiana

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF MISSISSIPPI:

LYNN FITCH, ATTORNEY GENERAL STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

By: <u>/s/ Hart Martin</u>

Hart Martin

Consumer Protection Division

Mississippi Attorney General's Office

Post Office Box 220

Jackson, Mississippi 39205 Telephone: 601-359-4223

Fax: 601-359-4231

Hart.martin@ago.ms.gov

Attorney for Plaintiff State of Mississippi

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF MISSOURI:

ANDREW BAILEY Attorney General

Amy.Haywood@ago.mo.gov

any Haywood

Missouri Attorney General's Office P.O. Box 899 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 Tel: 816-889-3090

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Missouri

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF MONTANA:

AUSTIN KNUDSEN Montana Attorney General

/s/ David M.S. Dewhirst
DAVID M.S. DEWHIRST
Solicitor General
P.O. Box 200151
Helena, MT 59620-0151
Phone: (406) 444-4500
Fax: (406) 442-1894
david.dewhirst@mt.gov

/s/ Charles J. Cooper

mmattioli@mt.gov

Charles J. Cooper ccooper@cooperkirk.com

David H. Thompson dthompson@cooperkirk.com

Brian W. Barnes bbarnes@cooperkirk.com

Harold S. Reeves <a hreeves@cooperkirk.com

COOPER & KIRK PLLC 1523 New Hampshire Avenue, NW Washington DC 20036

Phone: (202) 220-9620 Fax: (202) 220-9601

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Montana

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NEVADA:

AARON D. FORD Attorney General ERNEST D. FIGUEROA Consumer Advocate

/s/ Michelle C. Newman

Michelle C. Newman, Senior Deputy
Attorney General
mnewman@ag.nv.gov
Lucas J. Tucker (NV Bar No. 10252)
Senior Deputy Attorney General
LTucker@ag.nv.gov
Office of the Nevada Attorney General
100 N. Carson St.
Carson City, Nevada 89701 Tel:
(775) 684-1100

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Nevada

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Drew H. Wrigley Attorney General

By: /s/ Elin S. Alm

Parrell D. Grossman, ND ID 04684

Elin S. Alm, ND ID 05924 Assistant Attorneys General

Consumer Protection & Antitrust Division
Office of Attorney General of North Dakota

1720 Burlington Drive, Suite C, Bismarck, ND 58503-7736 (701) 328-5570

(701) 328-5568 (fax) pgrossman@nd.gov ealm@nd.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of North Dakota

FOR PLAINTIFF COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO:

/s/ Domingo Emanuelli-Hernández

Domingo Emanuelli-Hernández Attorney General Thaizza Rodríguez Pagán Assistant Attorney General PR Bar No. 17177 P.O. Box 9020192 San Juan, Puerto Rico 00902-0192 Tel: (787) 721-2900, ext. 1201, 1204 trodriguez@justicia.pr.gov

Kyle G. Bates HAUSFELD LLP 600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3200 San Francisco, CA 94111

Attorneys for Plaintiff Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA:

ALAN WILSON Attorney General

/s/ Mary Frances Jowers

Mary Frances Jowers
Assistant Deputy Attorney General
Rebecca M. Hartner (S.C. Bar No. 101302)
Assistant Attorney General
W. Jeffrey Young
Chief Deputy Attorney General
C. Havird Jones, Jr.
Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General
South Carolina Attorney General's Office
P.O. Box 11549
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1549

Phone: 803-734-3996

Email: mfjowers@scag.gov

Charlie Condon Charlie Condon Law Firm, LLC 880 Johnnie Dodds Blvd, Suite 1 Mount Pleasant, SC 29464 Phone:

843-884-8146

Email: charlie@charliecondon.com

James R. Dugan, II (pro hac vice) The Dugan Law Firm 365 Canal Street One Canal Place, Suite 1000 New Orleans, LA 70130 Phone: (504) 648-0180

Email: jdugan@dugan-lawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of South Carolina

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA:

MARTY JACKLEY Attorney General

/s/ Jonathan Van Patten

Jonathan Van Patten
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
1302 E. Highway 14, Suite 1
Pierre, SD 57501

Tel: 605-773-3215

jonathan.vanpatten@state.sd.us

Attorney for Plaintiff State of South Dakota

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF UTAH:

Sean D. Reyes Utah Attorney General

/s/ Marie W.L. Martin
Marie W.L. Martin
Assistant Attorney General
160 East 300 South, 5th Floor
P.O. Box 140874
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0872
mwmartin@agutah.gov

Telephone: (801) 538-9600

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Utah and as counsel for the Utah Division of Consumer Protection

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date:	
	Hon. P. Kevin Castel
	United States District Court
	Southern District of New York